

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:

The above-identified patent application has been amended and Applicants respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and again examine the claims as amended.

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claims 1-21 are rejected. Claims 1, 4-7, and 9-20 are amended herein. Claims 22-27 are new.

In accordance with the revised provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.121(c) as set forth in Official Gazette Notices: 25 February 2003, a marked up version of the amended claims is provided hereinabove.

The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Johnson et al. (US Patent number 5,553,209).

Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 17 to require that "... the symbol expansion display is displayed in combination with the one or more map display symbols."

Applicant submits that Claims 1 and 17 are patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "... the symbol expansion display is displayed in combination with the one or more map display symbols," as set forth in Claims 1 and 17.

With this particular arrangement, as described at page 3, lines 19-22, the present invention provides "...a technique for clearly displaying information on a map... . The symbol expansion display technique presents information relevant to each of the one or more map display symbols to a user in a manner which can easily be read." As shown in FIG 1, in one particular embodiment, the symbol expansion display, for example the symbol expansion display 60, is provided in combination with map display symbols 24a-24c. The symbol expansion

display, for example the symbol expansion display 60, can include symbol expansion graphics 62a-62c and symbol expansion data 64a-64c, all in combination with the map display symbols 24a-24c.

In contrast, Johnson et al. provides, as described in conjunction with FIG. 2b, at column 4, lines 7-9 "...replacing symbols which substantially overlap other symbols with their parent symbol in the next higher level of structure." The arrangement of Johnson et al., is represented in FIGS. 5a-5d, where in replacement of a map display symbol presented on a map display at a first scale, e.g. FIG. 5a, replacement map display symbols are shown on a map display at a second scale, e.g. FIGS. 5b-5d. Therefore, Applicant submits that Johnson does not teach the present invention, which requires a symbol expansion display displayed in combination with one or more map display symbols.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that Claims 1 and 17 are patentably distinct over Johnson et al.

Claims 2-16 depend from and thus include the limitations of Claim 1. Thus, Applicant submits that Claims 2-16 are allowable over Johnson et al. generally for the reasons discussed above in conjunction with Claim 1. Also, Claims 18-21 depend from and thus include the limitation of Claim 17. Thus, Applicant submits that Claims 18-21 are patentably distinct over Johnson et al. generally for the reasons discussed above in conjunction with Claim 17.

Claim 4 is amended herein to require "...presenting at least one of one or more symbol expansion graphics and one or more symbol expansion data associated with the selected record components in the symbol expansion display in combination with the one or more map display symbols." For substantially the same reasons as discussed above in conjunction with Claim 1, it is submitted that amended Claim 4 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggest "...presenting at least one of one or more symbol expansion graphics and one or more symbol expansion data associated with the selected record

components in the symbol expansion display in combination with the one or more map display symbols,” as set forth in amended Claim 4.

Claim 6 is amended herein to change dependency. Claims 5 and 6 depend from and thus include the limitation of Claim 4. Thus, Applicant submits that Claims 5 and 6 are further allowable over Johnson et al. generally for the reasons discussed above in conjunction with Claim 4.

Claim 7 is amended to require “...filtering the record data...to provide the one or more symbol expansion data...” It is submitted that Claim 7 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests “...filtering the record data...to provide the one or more symbol expansion data...” as set forth in Claim 7. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the above limitation at column 3, lines 25-35. Applicant can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of filtering as claimed and respectfully requests clarification.

It is submitted that Claim 8 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests “...selecting a record data type selected from the group consisting of a dollar asset range record data type, a friendliness range record data type, a personnel size record data type, a security classification record data type, a type of service record data type, and an age of symbol record data type,” as set forth in Claim 8. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the above limitations at column 8, lines 60-67. Applicant can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the above claimed limitations and respectfully requests clarification.

Claim 9 is amended in form only. It is submitted that Claim 9 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests “...filtering the record data...to provide...a selected record data range,” as set forth in Claim 9. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the above limitation at column 3, lines 25-35.

Applicant can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed record data range and respectfully requests clarification.

Claim 11 is amended in form only. It is submitted that Claim 11 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "...providing the one or more symbol expansion graphics, movable by the user on the computer map display," as set forth in Claim 11. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the above limitation at column 1, lines 15-22. Applicant can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed movable feature and respectfully requests clarification.

Claim 12 is amended in form only. It is submitted that Claim 12 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "...providing the one or more symbol expansion data, movable by the user on the computer map display," as set forth in Claim 11. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the above limitation at column 2, lines 60-67. Applicant can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed movable feature and respectfully requests clarification.

Claim 13 is amended in form only. It is submitted that Claim 13 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "...providing a user selectable language for the list of symbol expansion data," as set forth in Claim 13. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the above limitation at column 8, lines 60-67. Applicant can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed selectable language feature and respectfully requests clarification.

Claim 14 is amended in form and to change dependency. It is submitted that Claim 14 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "...providing a lead line from the map portion to the symbol expansion display," as set forth in Claim 14. An exemplary lead line is shown in FIG. 1 as lead line 66. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the above limitation at column 3, lines 5-13. Applicant can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed lead line and respectfully requests clarification.

Claim 15 is amended in form and to change dependency. It is submitted that Claim 15 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. "...color coding one or more of the one or more symbol expansion graphics to indicate an attribute of the object represented by one of the one or more map display symbols," as set forth in Claim 15. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the above limitation at column 1, lines 15-22. Applicant can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed color coding and respectfully requests clarification.

Claim 18 is amended herein to require "...presenting at least one of one or more symbol expansion graphics and one or more symbol expansion data associated with the selected record components in the symbol expansion display in combination with the one or more map display symbols." For substantially the same reason as discussed above in conjunction with Claim 17, it is submitted that amended Claim 18 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggest "...presenting at least one of one or more symbol expansion graphics and one or more symbol expansion data associated with the selected record components in the symbol expansion display in combination with the one or more map display symbols," as set forth in amended Claim 18.

Claim 19 is amended in form only. It is submitted that Claim 19 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "...providing the one or more symbol expansion graphics, movable by the user on the computer map display," as set forth in Claim 19. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the above limitation at column 1, lines 15-22. Applicant can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed movable feature and respectfully requests clarification.

Claim 20 is amended in form only. It is submitted that Claim 20 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "...providing the one or more symbol expansion data, movable by the user on the computer map display," as set forth in Claim 20. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the above limitation at

column 2, lines 60-67. Applicant can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed movable feature and respectfully requests clarification.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that the rejection of Claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) should be removed.

Claims 22-27 are new in the application. Claims 22-24 depend from and thus include the limitations of Claim 1. Thus, it is submitted that Claims 22-24 are allowable over the cited references of record in this case generally for the reasons discussed above in conjunction with Claim 1. Claims 25-27 depend from and thus include the limitations of Claim 17. Thus, it is submitted that Claims 25-27 are allowable over the cited references of record in this case generally for the reasons discussed above in conjunction with Claim 17.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant submits that Claims 1-27 and the entire case are in condition for allowance and should be sent to issue and such action is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Amendment or this application, he or she is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigning attorney.

Appl. No. 10/039,331  
Amdt. Dated October 22, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of July 30, 2003

Docket No. RTN-139PUS

The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 500845.

Dated: Oct 22, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

DALY, CROWLEY & MOFFORD, LLP

By: Kermit Robinson  
Kermit Robinson  
Reg. No. 48,734  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
275 Turnpike Street, Suite 101  
Canton, MA 02021-2354  
Tel.: (781) 401-9988, ext. 24  
Fax: (781) 401-9966

Q:\rtn\139pus\rtn-139pus resp to OA of 2003 07 30 as filed.doc